



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,779	02/08/2001	Jean M. Goldschmidt lki	42390P6482D	6746

7590

12/05/2006

Gordon R. Lindeen III
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

RAMAN, USHA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/779,779		GOLDSCHMIDT IKI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Usha Raman		2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-19, 21-22 and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (US PG Pub. 2006/0168620) in view of Morrison (US Pat. 6,359,580).

With regards to claims 1, 10 and 16 Schein discloses an apparatus and a method comprising:

Receiving an EPG at the electronic device (see [0026]);

Receiving a selection of entertainment program within the EPG from a user at the electronic device (see [0032], [0033]);

Identifying multiple available versions of the same selected entertainment program in the EPG (see [0034]), wherein each of the multiple versions of the same program has a set of characteristics (i.e. airtime, network, signal source, see [0031] and [0035]) indicated by program guide.

Schein also discloses the step of tagging each of the channels with a source identifier (i.e. characteristics) in a merged program guide (see [0018]. While Schein

discloses the step of selecting one of the multiple versions of a program for display (see [0037]) by the user, Schein fails to disclose the steps of:

Receiving and storing user preferences for entertainment program characteristics from a user at an electronic device;

Selecting by the electronic device, one of the multiple versions for display by comparing the different identified characteristics to the received user preferences for entertainment program characteristics.

Morrison discloses a multi-source television system and method comprising the steps of:

Receiving and storing user preferences for entertainment program characteristics (selection source) from a user at an electronic device (setting a default device by the user); see column 3, lines (7-10); and using the stored characteristics for automatically making a selection by the electronic device. See column 2, lines 59-61.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Schein in view of Morrison, by storing a user's default signal source preference (e.g. DBS), and selecting by the electronic device, one (e.g. NBC from DBS) of multiple versions (e.g. NBC from cable and DBS) by comparing the different identified characteristics (e.g. signal source: DBS) to the received user preferences for entertainment program characteristics. The motivation is to allow a user to specify a preferred source thereby alleviating the user from having to specify a source constantly.

With further regards to claim 10, the methods are computer executable instructions stored in memory (28) and executed by a processor (26). See Schein: [0024] and [0038]

With regards to claims 2, 11 and 17, the modified system comprises the step of identifying multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of one another (see Schein: [0038], step 402).

With regards to claims 3, 12 and 18, the multiple versions are provided on different transport media (i.e. DBS and cable), and the system further identifies information regarding the channel transport medium (see Schein: [0018]) and the selection comprises selecting based on the set of transport medium descriptive information (see Morrison: column 2, lines 59-66).

With regards to claims 4, 13, 19 the modified system comprises the step of identifying multiple versions that all start approximately at the same time. See Schein: [0038], step 402.

With regards to claims 5, and 14, the selection comprises selecting one of multiple versions having the identified characteristics (e.g. selection source) most closely resembling the user preferences (e.g. preferred selection source) for entertainment program characteristics. See Schein: [0018], [0031] and see Morrison: column 2, lines 59-66, column 3, lines 7-10.

With regards to claims 7, 15, and 21, the identified characteristic for each of the multiple versions includes the channel transport medium. See Schein [0018].

With regards to claim 9, the modified system comprises the step of identifying multiple versions in the EPG. See Schein: [0034], [0035].

With regards to claims 22, the modified system comprises the step of determining the user preferences by receiving preference information through manual inputs from a user. See Morrison: column 3, lines 4-10.

With regards to claims 25, the modified system comprises a user interface controller for receiving preferences through manual information inputs from a user. See Morrison: column 5, lines 1-9 and Schein: [0024]

4. Claims 6, 8, 20, 23-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (US PG Pub. 2006/0168620) in view of Morrison (US Pat. 6,359,580) as applied to claim 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Rosser (US Pat. 6,446,261).

Regarding claims 6 and 20, the modified system does not comprise the step of selecting one of multiple versions having the most number of characteristics that conform to user preferences.

Rosser teaches the step of using a set of user preferences to select one of multiple versions of content (col. 7 lines 45-57, col. 8 lines 20-65, col. 10 lines 20-35, col. 12 lines 1-20, 60-67, col. 13 lines 35-48, collecting data for an exclusive user database to select content). Rosser shows selecting one of a multiple of content versions based on a set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences (col. 8 lines 20-63, col. 12 lines 55-67, col. 13 lines 1-12, 35-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Rosser's teachings by selecting one of the multiple versions of the entertainment program having the most number of characteristics that conform to the user preferences in order to provide the user with a more customized stream of programming.

Regarding claims 8, 23, and 24, the modified system does not comprise the steps of identifying a user of an entertainment system, accessing user preferences for the identified user and then selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the accessed user preferences.

Rosser teaches the step of using a set of user preferences to select one of multiple versions of content (col. 7 lines 45-57, col. 8 lines 20-65, col. 10 lines 20-35, col. 12 lines 1-20, 60-67, col. 13 lines 35-48, collecting data for an exclusive user database to select content). Rosser shows identifying a user of an entertainment system (col. 15 lines 5-28), accessing user preferences for the identified user (col. 15 lines 28), and selecting content from versions of content based on a comparison of the sets of descriptive information (col. 14 lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Rosser's teachings by identifying a user of the system and then selecting one of the multiple versions of the entertainment program conforming to the identified user's preferences in

order to provide customized programming for each of the users a multi-user system.

With further regards to Claim 23 and 26, Rosser shows determining the user preferences by monitoring the behavior of the user (col. 8 lines 1-55, col. 9 lines 50-67, col. 12 lines 1-5).

Conclusion


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usha Raman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Usha Raman


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600